

Massachusetts Ocean Partnership Fund
Meeting Summary
Strategic Planning Group and Science/Technical Group Meeting
February 13, 2007 Salem, MA

MOPF held a joint meeting of its Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and Science and Technical Group (STG) on February 13 in Salem, MA. This meeting summary is intended to:

- provide SPG/STG participants, and those unable to attend, a synopsis of the meeting's outcomes and discussions, and
- apprise other interested parties of MOPF developments.

This document is being distributed to SPG and STG members and posted to the MOPF website. (www.mopf.org) It is organized in three parts: a meeting overview, a summary of key conclusions and outcomes, and supporting detail. A list of participants is attached.

Meeting Overview¹

John Bullard, SEA President and MOPF Steering Committee (SC)/SPG member, chaired the meeting. He noted the meeting would focus on improving the draft Strategic Plan and Science Plan, identifying areas of agreement and any significant areas of disagreement toward development of final versions for SPG endorsement. John observed that MOPF is asking participants to find a way to enroll in MOPF's overall goal while not making compromises they can't live with.

Tribute to Susan Snow-Cotter

Before the meeting got underway, John Bullard, on behalf of staff and the Steering Committee, offered a brief tribute to the tremendous contributions of the late Susan Snow-Cotter, Director of MA CZM and founding partner of MOPF. The group marked Susan's absence and honored her with a moment of silence.

Meeting Organization

The meeting was designed to afford ample opportunity for discussion among SPG and STG members. **Stephanie Moura**, MOPF Project Coordinator, began the morning plenary by outlining progress since October and providing an overview of the draft Strategic Plan and the draft Science Plan. After each overview, participants were asked give their general impressions of each draft and to identify issues or questions for later discussion. Following this initial feedback, participants were invited to reflect on whether/how both documents are effective for helping MOPF accomplish its goals and to offer specific suggestions to make them more effective. Morning discussion resurfaced some key questions about MOPF's role and vision; the group briefly reconvened in plenary after lunch to reaffirm fundamental aspects of role and vision. The bulk of the afternoon was devoted to two concurrent working sessions – one on the strategic plan and one on the science plan, with the goal of working through each document section-by-section to answer the following questions:

1. Is there anything important missing in the draft?
2. Can you offer any improvements or clarifications?
3. Are there any items you cannot live with?
4. If so, can you suggest a resolution or alternative?

¹ The meeting was condensed from one-and-a-half days to one day due to the threat of inclement weather.

At the end of the day, the groups reconvened in plenary to hear the results of each working session and to agree on next steps for moving forward.

The summary of discussions that follows presents key conclusions and outcomes with supporting detail from both plenary and working sessions summarized after that.

Key Conclusions and Outcomes

Reaffirmation of MOPF role

The plenary session reaffirmed the vision for MOPF's role and mission, as follows.

- Responsible state agencies will develop, implement and enforce an integrated ocean management plan. The state's effort may be bolstered by legislation or executive order, or it may continue to progress through ongoing coordination among the agencies in consultation with stakeholders.
- As a nimble public-private partnership, MOPF will support the state's and others' efforts by:
 - Facilitating collaboration and problem solving on tough issues among diverse stakeholders
 - Fostering effective integration of science and management, including improving the accessibility and synthesis of information and identifying options for ocean management
 - Leveraging financial, information and human resources

Strategic Plan

- Overall, participants felt that the draft document was thorough and well organized. SPG members did not identify any strategies or objectives that they could not live with at this point.
- Participants offered several valuable ways to improve the document. Key modifications agreed upon are summarized below; additional specific comments are reflected in the discussion points under each strategy in the supporting detail that begins on Page 5.
 - Sharpen Introduction: clarify MOPF vision and role; strengthen link to MA Ocean Task Force [Introduction and throughout]
 - Clarify timeframe for MOPF goal: five year planning horizon for MOPF; urgent need for ocean management plan as soon as can be achieved
 - Identify and emphasize *benefits* of integrated multi-use ocean management (for a range of sectors; short- and long-term), in addition to describing barriers [Section 1.1.1 and elsewhere]
 - Indicate how MOPF will improve stakeholder and public understanding of integrated multi-use ocean management: identify analogous public trust resource management models (e.g. public forests) that are more familiar to people, provide examples of integrated ocean management in other locations.
 - Clarify how MOPF can assist the state by identifying options for ocean management in MA; e.g. envisioning what a plan might look like and what information and other resources are needed to make it happen [Section 2.1]
 - Clarify how MOPF can add value to the development and use of indicators useful to managers and in communicating with lay audiences. [Section 2.4]
 - Emphasize the value of the *partnership* aspect of MOPF throughout document [Consider integrating strategy 4 into strategies 1 and 3]
 - Generally streamline the strategic plan (e.g. relocate the organizational items under 1.2 to an attachment) and consider the most effective ordering of strategies.
 - Consider how to link the Science Plan with the Strategic Plan.

- Participants agreed to aim for having an endorsement version of the strategic plan at the May 16-17 meeting.
- Prior to the May meeting, MOPF staff and Steering Committee will support SPG members' efforts to seek endorsement from their organizations/agencies through briefings, responding to information requests, etc.

Science Plan

- STG members agreed that MOPF can make a significant contribution to advancing integrated multi-use ocean management by concentrating efforts in three main areas:
 - Cataloging uses that affect the coastal ocean ecosystem, including identifying new and emerging uses
 - Characterizing coastal ocean ecosystem processes, functions and services at a high spatial resolution
 - Facilitating dialogue between the scientific and management/policy communities
 - Improving accessibility of data systems for a variety of users/audiences
 - Developing fully dynamic approaches to evaluate the human activity - ecosystem response feedback loop
 - Supporting enhanced mapping efforts
 - Coordinating development of indicators of the ocean ecosystem's capacity to provide services
 - Identifying key gaps in natural and social science information to support integrated ocean management and supporting efforts to fill those gaps. MOPF should begin by looking at gaps identified by state agencies and the MA Task Force.
- Participants generally agreed the current version of the science plan is unrealistic for a 5-year time horizon; the action steps need to be pared down.

Next Steps: Organizing Work Going Forward

- Participants underscored the importance of briefing key legislators and administration officials about MOPF in the near future.
- Key milestones for completing the Strategic Plan and Science Plan are identified in the tables on the next page.

Abbreviations

IMUOM= integrated multi-use ocean management
 EBM = ecosystem-based management
 MOPF = Massachusetts Ocean Partnership Fund
 SC = Steering Committee
 SPG = Strategic Planning Group
 STG = Science and Technical Group

Schedule for Completing Strategic Plan and Science Plan

Five Year Strategic Plan			Science Plan		
Schedule	Action	Who	Schedule	Action	Who
Ongoing	Support SPG members' efforts to garner endorsement of Strategic Plan from organization/agency/group	Staff and Steering Com.	Thru mid-March	Update draft Science Plan w/ input from Feb. 13 meeting	Staff
Thru early April	Update draft Strategic Plan with input from Feb. 13 meeting and additional SPG input, as needed.	Staff, Consultant and Steering Com.	Late March	Circulate revised Science Plan to STG Circulate Draft Gap Analysis to STG	Staff and Gap Consultant
Early-mid April	Circulate updated draft Strategic Plan to SPG	Staff	Mid-April	STG meeting. Goal - agree on final Science Plan elements. (Review updated Science Plan; identify elements of Gap Analysis to incorporate in Science Plan)	STG (SPG invited)
Late April	SPG written comments on updated draft Strategic Plan	SPG	Late April	Prepare final draft Science Plan w/ input from April STG mtg	Staff
Early May	Prepare final draft Strategic Plan considering SPG comments	Staff and Consultant	Early May	Final draft Science Plan circulated to STG for final comment	STG



Schedule	Action	Who
Early May	Distribute final draft Strategic Plan and final draft Science Plan to SPG	Staff
May 16-17	SPG meeting: Develop and agree on endorsable version of Strategic Plan; agree on role of Science Plan and linkage/integration with Strategic Plan	SPG
Early June	Finalize Strategic Plan and Science Plan Send out for printing	Staff and Consultant
End June	Distribute Strategic Plan and Science Plan to SPG, STG; submit to Moore Foundation	Staff

Supporting Detail from Plenary and Working Sessions

Strategic Plan Discussions

Introduction

- Strengthen connection between strategic plan and MA Ocean Task Force efforts. Beyond integrated ocean management and filling information gaps, identify other OTF recommendations MOPF is building on.

Strategy 1 – Maintain MOPF as a consistent presence

- Advancing IMUOM will require an advocate with credibility and resources. Does “consistent presence” mean MOPF will be that advocate? If so, define what that means.
- There was considerable discussion about MOPF’s role vs. the state’s role in developing IMUOM plan for MA, MOPF’s source of influence, how ocean management is affected whether there is a legislative mandate and related issues.
 - SPG and STG members raised concerns about MOPF’s influence and what real authority exists to develop an ocean management plan absent legislation.
 - Some felt MOPF needs a mandate to be a serious player.
 - Others felt MOPF’s “standing” shouldn’t depend on any particular mandate. Sources of influence include:
 - Creation of strong, diverse partnerships
 - Synthesizing/ coordinating information on ocean management
 - Leveraging resources to support science, partnerships, etc.
 - Some felt it was important for MOPF not to be seen as advocating for any particular legislation in order to be perceived as an “honest broker”.
 - MOPF should consider potential problems if “bad” legislation passes or if it precludes MOPF involvement in implementation.
- Participants agreed it is necessary to articulate more clearly what the state is doing toward IMUOM and how MOPF would relate to it. (*See “Reaffirmation of MOPF Role” on pg 2.*) The vision of MOPF as a supporter of IMUOM is too vague; need more detail for people to understand. e.g. “MOPF is an entity thinking ahead about future IMUOM planning: developing principles for the planning, potential elements and components of plans, scientific information, framework, etc. and has funding available to support government when it is ready to move forward.”
- Recognizing the US Commission and the MA Ocean Task Force declared the need for improving ocean management systems - what story does the strategic plan tell about what MOPF will do to build on that?
Assertive role:
 - IMUOM planning as an experiment that MOPF undertakes - “learning by doing”.
 - Spatially explicit pilot projects or developing a model for a larger area could help create standing or authority for MOPF if the experiment is useful.Vs. Facilitative role:
 - MOPF efforts to develop needed information and management approaches would cue up a successful planning effort by responsible state agencies
 - MOPF can help envision what a plan could look like and what is needed (e.g. science) to make it happen

- Add examples of barriers MOPF might identify (section 1.1.1): e.g.
 - Lack of science
 - Resistance to another layer of management

- Focus on / enumerate benefits of IMUOM. Benefits might include:
 - Greater certainty for users, investors, etc. about where activities could occur
 - Reduction in number of conflicts on specific projects
 - Will be dealt with up front in the development process
 - Government enforcement of plan would put financial costs of conflict resolution on the government rather than proponent
 - Streamlined regulatory processes
 - Allows user groups to help frame/resolve issues up front and reduce need for crisis management mode - won't have to fight same battle repeatedly
 - Could strengthen influence of MA CZM regarding federal actions outside state waters
 - Allows long term vision and planning
 - Simplifies public participation processes and resource allocation for it
 - Allows consideration of sustaining ecosystems

- MOPF as an entity (section 1.1.2):
 - Make organizational / administrative actions a separate section, perhaps an attachment
 - Highlight organization characteristics: nimble, objective, credible, honest broker
 - Governance
 - Balanced enough for all sectors to feel they have access
 - Separate fiduciary governance from policy governance
 - Clarify differences between supporting partners and governing partners
 - Governing partners/board no more than 12
 - Need conflict of interest provisions for governing partners receiving funding

Strategy 2 – Integrating science and management

- Current strategy description seems to cover mostly data management; need to make clear development of science is also part of the strategy. Broaden language of strategy title to include: *acquisition* and accessibility of information.

- Clarify link between the science plan and Strategy 2 of the strategic plan and move 2.3 earlier in order of strategy 2 objectives.

- Don't use the term "model" for IMUOM. (section 2.1) Emphasize identifying or developing "options for" or "examples of" IMUOM useful for MA.

- Zoning may not be the most useful analogy for integrated ocean management.
 - Must recognize the public trust aspect of planning for the ocean.
 - Identify analogous processes besides zoning, e.g. public parks/forest resource management planning
 - Maybe "place-based marine planning" to clarify it is spatially organized, rather than by use or sector.
 - Economic incentives need to play a role, not just ocean zoning

- What is the scientific value added by MOPF, given its focus on MA rather than on the region (section 2.2)?
 - Value in coordination and amplification
 - Bring elements and approaches of regional efforts to MA to help fill data needs
- Different types of indicators (section 2.4)
 - Indicators for scientific use
 - Indicators to communicate to managers and the public about ocean management
 - Indicators of MOPF's success
- How can MOPF add value to development and use of indicators?
 - Focus on managers' needs and educating lay audiences, not the technical/scientific community.
 - Developing a few indicators of ocean's capacity to provide ecosystem services would be quite an undertaking. Even though the intended audience isn't scientists, it would take scientists to develop multivariate, synthetic indicators.
 - Public needs to understand – “are things getting better or worse?”
 - Critical for MOPF to be aware of and coordinate with other existing efforts to develop indicators.

Strategy 3 – Informed, engaged public

- Clarify MOPF's goals for public engagement:
 - Establish credibility of MOPF
 - Work with targeted audiences/stakeholders to advance IMUOM
 - Longer-term: “turn general public into stakeholders”
- Make sure MOPF's outreach plan includes research on what it takes to engage the public, effective messaging and communication tools for targeted audiences, etc. (section 3.1.2)
- What is the process to undertake outreach? Will MOPF seek consensus on the messages it communicates? Present a range of views?
- Many underscored a valuable role for MOPF, where there is currently a void: convening / facilitating forums to clarify and discuss integrated ocean management among broad interests: regulators, fishing industry, port operators, energy interests, etc. (section 3.2)

Strategy 4 - Catalyze partnerships

- Consider integrating partnership actions into strategies 1 and 3, but retain emphasis on partnership building throughout document
 - Clarify the objectives of establishing the formal “Partnership” vs. catalyzing other partnerships among stakeholders.
- Add details about what will make the partnership work; e.g. MOPF will get the right people in the room at the right time with a good facilitator and financial support for discussions
- Consider how to build partnerships with and among stakeholders who weren't involved in developing MOPF's strategic plan; there may be resistance
- Consider smaller groups with specific expertise or interest to generate proposals for MOPF consideration (NEFMC model), rather than developing a standing stakeholder advisory group
- Make effective use of electronic tools for stakeholder engagement

Other comments on Strategic Plan

- Who are the audiences for MOPF's Strategic Plan:
 - SPG members – critical for endorsement
 - Funding community
 - Other stakeholders, constituents
- The plan is not currently conducive to engaging broader public. Consider how to appeal to broader constituencies, perhaps on issues related to food chain impacts and real estate values.
- Develop an executive summary or abstract
- Delete resource requirements from strategic plan and create a separate document for relevant audiences (e.g. funders).
- Tell a story about what it would look like if MOPF succeeds, illustrated with examples of existing problems that would be fixed.
- Consider creating a better name: perhaps MA Ocean Partnership

Science Plan

- MOPF's science plan should consider issues identified as high priority by the state (e.g. in Task Force report) as well as important issues no one else is working on.
 - Elements of strategic plan Strategy 2 and science plan seem unrealistic for a 5-year time horizon
- There was no definitive agreement about the sequence of the three focus areas. One suggestion was to incorporate focus 1 and 2 in a nested sequence as a precursor to achieving focus 3.
- Scientific community expects to play a partnership role, not be perceived as simply in the service of managers.
- Participants debated the usefulness of mapping and modeling for different applications.
 - Some felt it is not efficient to map all of MA waters and generic models are not particularly useful, so mapping/modeling should focus on specific study areas of interest for development or for some other reason.
 - Others noted that even a simple simulation, (e.g. SimCity) would be useful to managers, even if just to identify variables important for specific management decisions. These kinds of simulations are being developed and used at Duke and in CA.

Gap Analysis Update

Maggie Mooney-Seus of Fort Hill Associates provided a progress update on the Gap Analysis. The literature review is nearly completed and interviews with area scientists and managers are underway.

Next Steps

The meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps. See “Organizing Work Going Forward”, pages 3-4 above.

**Massachusetts Ocean Partnership Fund
Strategic Planning Group, Science Technical Group and Steering Committee Members**

Names in **bold** attended Feb 13, 2007 SPG/STG meeting in Salem.

- ! Indicates member of Strategic Planning Group
- + Indicates member of the Science Technical Group
- * Indicates member of the Steering Committee

	First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Title
!	Bill	Adler	MA Lobstermen's Association MA Fisheries Commission	Executive Director Member
*!	Priscilla	Brooks	Conservation Law Foundation	Director Ocean Conservation Program
+	Moira	Brown	New England Aquarium	Right Whale Senior Scientist
*!	John	Bullard	Sea Education Association	Executive Director
!	Rick	Burnes	Charles River Ventures	Co-founder, Partner
!	Bruce	Carlisle	MA Office of Coastal Zone Management	Acting Director
!	Fara	Courtney	Good Harbor Consulting	President
+	Jud	Crawford	Conservation Law Foundation	Senior Scientist
!	Richard	Delaney	Horsley Witten Group	Executive Vice President
*!	Paul	Diodati	MA Division of Marine Fisheries	Director
+	John	Duff	University of MA, Boston	Assistant Professor of Environmental Law
+	Mike	Fogarty	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute New England Fishery Management Council	Adjunct Scientist, Biology
+	Kathryn	Ford	MA Division of Marine Fisheries	Marine Habitat Specialist
!	Barry	Gibson	Recreational Fishing Alliance	New England Regional Director
!	Deborah	Hadden	Massport	Deputy Port Director
!	Jim	Hunt	Environmental and Energy Services, City of Boston	Chief
+	Lew	Incze	University of Southern Maine Gulf of Maine Research Council	Research Professor
+	Les	Kauffman	Boston University	Professor of Biology

+	Jason	Link	National Marine Fisheries Service	Food Web Dynamics Program Leader
+	Stormy	Mayo	Provincetown Center for Coastal Studies	Director, Right Whale Habitat Studies
!	Greg	McGregor	MA Association of Conservation Commissions	Board of Directors
!	Betsy	Nicholson	NOAA Coastal Services	NOAA Regional Coastal Management Specialist
!	David	O'Connor	MA Division of Energy Resources	Commissioner
!	Jackie	Odell	Northeast Seafood Coalition	Executive Director
*!	Robbin	Peach	Massachusetts Environmental Trust	Executive Director
+	Judy	Pederson	MIT/SeaGrant	Coastal Resources Specialist & Manager
!	Mark	Rasmussen	Coalition for Buzzards Bay	Executive Director
!	Bud	Ris	New England Aquarium	President
!	Leona	Roach	MA Marine Trades Assoc.	Executive Director
*!+	Andy	Rosenberg	UNH-Institute for Study of Earth, Oceans and Space	Professor of Natural Resources and Earth, Oceans and Space
!+	Brian	Rothschild	University of MA, Dartmouth - School for Marine Science and Technology	Professor – Fisheries, Oceanography Co-Dir.- MA Marine Fisheries Institute
+	James	Sanchirico	Resources for the Future	Senior Fellow
+	Andy	Solow	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute	Environmental & Ecological Statistician
+	Dave	Terkla	University of MA, Boston	Professor of Environmental Economics
!	Sue	Tierney	The Analysis Group	Managing Principal
!	Bruce	Tobey	City of Gloucester	City Councilor
*!	Greg	Watson	MA Technology Collaborative	VP Sustainable Development & Renewable Energy
+	Peter	Wiebe	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute	Senior Scientist, Biology
!	Jack	Wiggin	Urban Harbors Institute	Executive Director

! Indicates member of Strategic Planning Group

+ Indicates member of the Science Technical Group

* Indicates member of the Steering Committee